

**Description and Mechanisms of Bacterial Growth Responses
to Water Activity and Compatible Solutes**

by

Karen Krist

BAgrSc (Hons.) University of Tasmania

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy**

University of Tasmania

November, 1997

*Accepted for publication
See*

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis contains no material which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by the University of Tasmania or any other institution, and to the best of my knowledge and belief contains no copy or paraphrase of material previously published or written by another person except where due acknowledgment is made in the text of the thesis.



K.A. Krist

19/2/1998

This thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying in accordance with the *Copyright Act 1968*.



K.A. Krist

19/2/1998

ABSTRACT

Bacterial growth is inhibited by unfavourably low water activity conditions, however, the inhibition is partly alleviated by exogenous provision of compatible solutes. As compatible solutes exist in all food systems, describing and understanding this bacterial growth response is useful for food microbiologists concerned with limiting microbial growth on foods using water activity stress.

In the first application of predictive microbiology techniques to compatible solute growth responses, the four parameter square root model (Ratkowsky *et al.*, 1983) successfully described growth rate data collected for *Escherichia coli*, *Paracoccus halodenitrificans* and *Halomonas elongata*. The value of the parameter T_{min} was independent of the exogenous provision of compatible solutes, but $a_{w\ min}$ values and the observed minimum temperature for growth were lower where compatible solutes were provided.

Despite their accurate description of growth rate data, empirical square root models do not improve mechanistic understanding. A mechanistic explanation for the bacterial growth response to water activity and compatible solutes was examined using a substrate-limited batch culture technique, developed to measure cell yield. The cell yield of *E. coli* did not vary significantly with extracellular water activity or compatible solutes, except at water activity values close to the growth/no growth interface, indicating that water activity challenge is not an energetic burden for bacterial cells. Therefore, energetic limitation of growth was eliminated as a possible mechanistic explanation. Cell yield was also independent of incubation temperature, over most of the biokinetic range. The cell yield responses with water activity and temperature conditions were similar and consistent with a mechanistic, thermodynamic model (McMeekin *et al.*, 1993; Ross, 1993), thus the influence of water activity on microbial growth may be explained in terms of the thermodynamics of protein folding. This mechanism is consistent with contemporary models for the effect of compatible solutes on water structure close to the surface of macromolecules (Wiggins, 1990).

Examination of novel and published data using the thermodynamic model revealed a possible mechanism for the temperature and water activity limits for microbial growth. Large increases in the activation energy, close to the boundary between growth permissible and non-growth conditions, suggest a possible universal limiting activation energy for bacterial growth. This finding may provide a mechanistic basis for, currently empirical, growth/no growth models.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my academic supervisor Professor Tom McMeekin and my research supervisor Dr. Tom Ross for providing the opportunity and for their endless support and encouragement during the course of my studies (even through bouts of what can only be described as 'irrational female behaviour'). I am also deeply indebted to Dr. June Olley for her time, patience and inspiration, particularly during the preparation of my thesis.

I also extend my sincerest thanks to Dr. Erwin Galinski and Professor Phillipa Wiggins for freely sharing their advice and expertise.

Special thanks must also go to staff members at the Department of Agricultural Science, especially David Ratkowsky, Sally Jones, Bill Peterson and Laura Maddock, as well as the Food Microbiology Group and other fellow students. Also a million thankyou's to my friends and families (the Krists and the Fosters) for their love and encouragement. And the biggest thankyou of all to Sonny, for always believing in me.

The funding for this project was provided by the Meat Research Corporation and is gratefully acknowledged.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Food Microbiology	1
1.1.1 Foodborne pathogens	2
1.1.2 Pathogenic <i>E. coli</i>	2
1.1.3 Environment and bacterial growth	6
1.1.4 Predictive microbiology	13
1.2 Water Activity Stress Physiology	18
1.2.1 Cell membrane	18
1.2.2 Protein synthesis	20
1.2.3 Cytoplasmic water activity	20
1.2.4 Case study - <i>E. coli</i>	22
1.2.4.1 Primary response	22
1.2.4.2 Secondary response	26
1.2.4.3 Exogenous compatible solutes	28
1.2.5 General stress response	37
1.3 Compatible Solute Mechanisms	38
1.3.1 Surface tension	39
1.3.2 High density water	40
1.3.3 Cytoplasmic volume	41
1.4 Objectives	42

2. HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Introduction	43
2.1.1 Square root models	43

2.2 Materials and Methods	49
2.2.1 Influence of a_w and betaine on <i>E. coli</i> growth rate	49
2.2.2 Influence of a_w and betaine on growth for the biokinetic range	50
2.3 Results	51
2.3.1 Influence of a_w and betaine on <i>E. coli</i> growth rate at 37°C	51
2.3.2 Influence of betaine on $a_w \min$	51
2.3.3 Influence of a_w and betaine on growth for the biokinetic range	52
2.3.4 Influence of a_w and betaine on lag time	55
2.3.5 Influence of a_w and betaine on cardinal temperatures	57
2.3.6 Influence of a_w and betaine on the temperature range for growth	57
2.4 Discussion	59
2.4.1 Influence of betaine on $a_w \min$	59
2.4.2 Influence of a_w and betaine on cardinal temperatures	62
2.4.3 Influence of a_w and betaine on the temperature range for growth	63
2.5 Summary and Working Hypothesis	68
 3. ENERGY DIVERSION	
3.1 Introduction	69
3.1.1 Cell yield	69
3.1.2 Maintenance energy	71
3.1.3 Estimation of maintenance energy	73
3.2 Protocol Development	77
3.2.1 Materials and methods	77
3.2.2 Results	80
3.2.3 Discussion	89
3.3 Hypothesis Testing	95
3.3.1 Materials and methods	95
3.3.2 Results	98
3.3.3 Discussion	111
3.4 Summary	119

4. ACTIVATION ENERGY

4.1	Introduction	120
4.2	Materials and Methods	120
4.3	Results	122
4.4	Discussion	132
4.4.1	Activation energy and water activity	132
4.4.2	Mechanistic basis	136
4.4.3	Implications	137

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	140
--------------------------------	------------

REFERENCES	142
-------------------	------------

APPENDIX 1	176
-------------------	------------

APPENDIX 2	177
-------------------	------------

APPENDIX 3	187
-------------------	------------

APPENDIX 4	207
-------------------	------------

APPENDIX A	210
-------------------	------------